UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION V

DATE: 10/18/00 (Resubmittal)

SUBJECT: Review of Data
Received for review on 7/26/00

FROM: Stephen L. Ostrodka, Chief (SMF-4J) /LF
Superfund Field Services Section

TO: Data User: _____

We have reviewed the data by CADRE for the following case:

SITE NAME: Master Metals

CASE NUMBER: _____ **SDG NUMBER:** _____

Number and Type of Samples: 2 (soil)

Sample Numbers: _____

Laboratory: TestAmerica Hrs. for Review: _____

Following are our findings:

The lead results are acceptable with the qualifications described in the attached narrative

L. Finkelberg
10/23/2000

CC: Cecilia Moore
Region 5 TPO
Mail Code: SM-5J

Site: Master Metals
Laboratory: TestAmerica

Narrative

The laboratories portion of this case contains 2 samples analyzed for total solids and lead. The samples are field duplicates.

Evidential Audit: All documents provided are copies. No location is noted for the originals. No airbill (original or copy) was provided. No SAS request was provided; results were evaluated using the laboratory SOP. No inventory checklist or DC-1 were present. The case was not submitted in a standard data package format. No reporting forms were provided for the ICP serial dilution or ICB/CCB's. The cooler containing the samples was received at the laboratory with no ice. No temperature was documented.

Although two ICP analysis runs were performed for the generation of data relating to this case, the reporting form for the continuing calibration verification contained only one CCV and no ICV's. It is not clear why the second analysis run was performed and appears that the QC sample (reanalyzed in the second analysis run) was reprepped prior to analysis. No preparation log was included for the reprep. Notations on the analytical sequence for the second run seem to indicate that the QC sample plus 5 other samples may have been reprepped prior to analysis. No results were included for the percent solids for the QC sample (not part of this case).

ICP: The laboratory did not provide the detection limit for lead; therefore the reporting limit was used in evaluating the serial dilution. The QC sample result is less than 50 times the reporting limit and is therefore the serial dilution is not applicable. Blanks are below the reporting limit and are not at a level where the samples would be affected. The sample concentration of the spiked sample is greater than four times the concentration of the spike, thus invalidating the spike as a QC audit. Although not applicable, spike recoveries calculated by this reviewer did not agree with reported values.

All quality control analyses were performed on another sample from the same preparation batch, not one of the samples in this case. Two analysis runs were performed; the duplicate RPD in the first analysis (29.7%; performed as a matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate) was outside the established laboratory control limit indicating poor precision. The duplicate RPD for the second analysis run was acceptable (2.1%).

Lead results are acceptable.

Other Qualifiers: No total solids are provided for the sample used for QC; however, all QC limits (where applicable) were within established limits. Actual results of the QC sample are not relevant to this case.

Reviewed by: Stephen Connet **Date: September 19, 2000**